SINGLE BENCH

CF1002 (4) (2)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 7502 /2006

WRIT PETITION U/A 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA,

PETITIONER

Jagdish Chandra Yadav, aged about 38 years, son of Shri Siddheshwar Yadav, Assistant Teacher, Government Tribal Middle School, Tangar-dih, Bagicha, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) (SL.NO. 17 of Annexure P-1)

P.R. No. 26/5/06 Presented by RK Mugum Dated 22/12/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through – Secretary, Department of Tribal Welfare, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

RECEIVED-COPY 20/12/06 CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

2. The Assistant Commissioner, Department of Tribal Welfare, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

3. The Block Education officer, Block Bagicha, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

(24)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P. (s) No. 7500 of 2006

Petitioner : Panch Ram Navrang

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7501 of 2006

Petitioner : Jugal Ram Chakresh

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7502 of 2006

Petitioner : Jagdish Chandra Yadav

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7503 of 2006

Petitioner : Dici Sai Paikra

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7504 of 2006

Petitioner : Nandkeshwar Ram Bhagat

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7505 of 2006

Petitioner : Samelal Khunte

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7508 of 2006

Petitioner : Smt. Philomina Kindo

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7509 of 2006

Petitioner : Shyam Sunder Yadav

Versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisaarh and another

(25)

W. P. (s) No. 7510 of 2006

Petitioner : Hilariyus Kujur
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7511 of 2006

Petitioner : Ku. Rajkumari Dahariya
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7512 of 2006

Petitioner : Rang Vallabh Sidar
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7513 of 2006

Petitioner : Ramdular Keshkar
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7514 of 2006

Petitioner : Pradyumn Kumar
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7515 of 2006

Petitioner : Smt. Lukishiya Minj
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7516 of 2006

Petitioner : Timothiyus Toppo
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7517 of 2006

Petitioner : Amrit Kumar
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7518 of 2006 (26)

Petitioner : Dular Ekka
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7519 of 2006

Petitioner : Alfrad Kujur
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

W. P. (s) No. 7521 of 2006

Petitioner : Prabhu Sai Tirky
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7522 of 2006

Petitioner : Jagannath Ram
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7523 of 2006

Petitioner : Mainar Sai Paikra
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7524 of 2006

Petitioner : Smt. Rebeka Minj
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P. (s) No. 7525 of 2006

Petitioner : Ajit Kumar Tirky
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

And

W. P. (s) No. 7526 of 2006

Petitioner : Ramkumar Banjare
Respondents versus State of Chhattisgarh and another

(27)

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri, J

Mr. A.N. Bhakta, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mrs. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORDER

(Passed on 9th day of January, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as learned Deputy Government Advocate appearing for the respondents/State jointly submit that the facts of the present case are similar to that of in W. P. (s) 5976 of 2006 (Sushil Tiwari & others Vs. State Govt. of Chhattisgarh & others), which was allowed vide order dated 7th November, 2006. They further submit that the question of law involved is also the same.

2. In view of the above stated submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, these writ petitions are allowed in terms of the order dated 7th November, 2006 passed by this Court in W. P. (s) 5976 of 2006. No order as to costs.

3. A copy of this order be placed on record in other connected writ petitions.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash